

### REMARKS

Claims 13-18 are pending. By this Amendment, no claims are cancelled, claims 13-18 are amended and no new claims are added.

Applicant thanks the Examiner for the indication of allowable subject matter in claims 14-18.

### Summary of March 29, 2006 Discussion

Applicant submits that the substance of the discussion between the Examiner and the undersigned on March 29, 2006, is accurately described in the Examiner's Interview Summary, mailed April 3, 2006, and of record in the file of this case.

### Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 112

Claims 13-18 were rejected as indefinite because "projection device" was not positively recited, thereby raising a "combination/subcombination problem." In response, claims 13-18 have been amended to positively recite a projection device, thereby obviating the rejection.

Claim 16 was rejected as indefinite in that it recites a "surround portion" for which it was said antecedent basis was lacking. In response, claim 16 has been amended to change the dependency thereof from claim 13 to claim 14 as suggested by the Examiner. In that claim 14 provides antecedent basis for a surround portion, Applicant respectfully submits this rejection has been obviated.

Claim 16 was also rejected as indefinite in that the term "structure" was said to raise a "combination/subcombination problem." In response, claim 16 has been amended to recite that the claimed system is adapted to be coupled to the structure. Applicant respectfully submits that this amendment to claims overcomes the rejection and accordingly requests that it be withdrawn.

Application No. 10/821,659

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claim 13 was rejected as obvious over Lovell in view of Dittmer '658 and in further view of Dang et. al. '240. Applicant respectfully traverses these rejections. The suggested combination of references does not teach all features of the claimed invention, and in any case is improper, in that no motivation exists for one of ordinary skill in the art to have combined the teachings of Lovell and Dittmer, which relate to mounting devices for projectors, with Dang et. al. which relates to a subsurface vault for traffic signal apparatus.


Nevertheless, solely to advance prosecution of the present application and without any waiver or disclaimer of subject matter, Applicant has amended independent claim 13 to recite that the claimed enclosure encloses not only the projection device, but also the device interface bracket and the suspension member interface portion. In this claimed embodiment of the invention, the enclosure provides an additional measure of protection against undesired tampering by inhibiting unauthorized access to the mounting device as well as the projection device. In contrast, the primary reference Lovell only discloses an enclosure for the projection device itself, thereby leaving the remainder of the mounting device exposed and accessible by unauthorized persons. In that the cited references do not teach all aspects of the claimed invention, Applicant respectfully submits that the claimed invention cannot be rendered obvious thereby. As a result, Applicant respectfully requests that this rejection be withdrawn.

In view of the foregoing, it is submitted that this application is in condition for allowance. Favorable consideration and prompt allowance of the application are respectfully requested.

The Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned if the Examiner believes it would be useful to advance prosecution.

Application No. 10/821,659

Respectfully submitted,



Bradley J. Thorson  
Registration No. 52,288

Customer No. 24113  
Patterson, Thunte, Skaar & Christensen, P.A.  
4800 IDS Center  
80 South 8th Street  
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55402-2100  
Telephone: (612) 349-5756